

SECRET

6 September 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

THROUGH: Deputy Director (Plans) *mt* 6 SEP 1960

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of the CIA Training Program

1. I am glad to have an opportunity to look over this Survey. There has not been time to review it in depth but I assume that at a later stage we shall have an opportunity to comment formally on those recommendations which particularly regard the Clandestine Service. Meanwhile, I am sending along the following informal observations none of which really involve any questions affecting the main tenor of the Survey and its conclusions. It is an excellent piece of work and its principal themes and its identification of the chief areas of weakness in present practice are pretty generally consistent with views which a number of us within the DD/P area have been developing over the last year.

2. The recruitment of instructors for the Operations School (page 31) is a problem and most of the reasons for the problem are suggested in the Survey. It has another side: i.e., the rotation of OTR careerists into the Clandestine Service in order to provide them operational experience. In trying to find overseas assignments, these careerists are competing not only with experienced CS officers, but with a number, some of fairly senior grade, who have not had such experience, who want it, and for whom we are also trying to find opportunities. I think that some of us are about ready to challenge the philosophy that OTR careerists should be provided operational experience at all, and consequently ready to accept an obligation on the part of the Clandestine Service to provide out of its own ranks all instructors whose duties make operational experience mandatory. While in practice we have been providing large numbers of instructors, we have never sat down with OTR to list those specific jobs which should ideally be filled by CS men and formally undertaken to keep them filled. Although initially this would not be an easy responsibility to meet in all cases, I suspect, hopefully, that we are approaching a period in which a greater attention to training, and a clearer definition of what the CS needs from and should put into training, will contribute to a somewhat better attitude toward tours of duty with OTR and thus make this task an easier one to handle.

SECRET

SECRET

3. I have some reservations regarding the proposal for a DD/P Training and Doctrine Officer (page 40), particularly if he were to be considered literally responsible for the development of operational doctrine. The possibility of a full-time DD/P Training Officer has been discussed here and the DD/P now plans to make such an appointment. This decision stems from our realization that there is at this time a real job to be done in clarifying exactly what kind of training the Clandestine Service needs at this stage, in ascertaining how fully the content of present courses jibes with these needs, and that to get to the bottom of these questions and to work out some of the present kinks in the functional relationship of the CS and OTR cannot be done expeditiously on a part-time basis.

4. The question of doctrine seems to me to be another matter and one that far transcends what any one man can do. As you know, both CA and CI Staffs are producing detailed analyses of kinds and methods of operations in their fields, and the effort to distill experience in the collection field into a series of doctrinal publications is now the principal task of FI/OPS Group. While I do not doubt that more could be done, and done more consistently, in passing CS experience and theory to OTR (and the chief shortage is, I think, in case history material) I am impressed by the degree to which CI Staff participates in and contributes to training in its specialty, by the quality and success of FI Staff's regularly scheduled "Denied Area Seminar"; and, to cite two recent examples, by CA Staff's work with OTR in the newly inaugurated paramilitary courses and IO Division's thorough efforts in the new Labor Operations Course. In this last course, as a matter of fact, CS participation was general. The initial syllabus was circulated to all Divisions and Staffs for comment and useful comment was largely forthcoming.

5. I am in hearty agreement with practically all the Survey's conclusions and recommendations regarding language training. There is no question but that we are gravely deficient in this field although I am convinced that a great many of us have little sympathy with the view (page 67) that "a good job can be done without foreign languages" or that in areas where English is commonly spoken by the people we are apt to be in official contact with there is little need to try to deal in the other man's tongue, particularly if it is a difficult one. Communication is only half the problem. The other half is understanding. There can be little intimate understanding of the minds of people without a sense of their traditions, education, and ethos which simply cannot be approached through any language other than their own.

SECRET

25X1A

6. I would make two other comments concerning the language portion



7. My second comment concerns the survey of language requirements mentioned on page 66. The DD/P completed such a survey about 2½ years ago. This is available to OTR. It was proposed recently that another survey be made and I opposed our undertaking this in view of the fact that the testing program was at that point less than 25% complete. A new analysis of our language requirements would not vary greatly from that done 3 years ago save in certain readily definable areas of new prominence (e.g., Africa). What we meanwhile particularly lacked was a knowledge of what competence we actually had. This can be reached only with the completion of a testing program. We have encouraged that program and the participation of CS personnel in it.

8. The survey of general training requirements mentioned on page 66 has now been completed by WH and SR Divisions. I doubt that it is exact to suggest that these surveys are primarily related to individual needs and desires. While they are not related to specific positions, they are related to divisional needs. Our purpose in inviting these divisional surveys was a double one: (a) to get some kind of realistic forecast which would permit OTR to plan ahead with reasonable assurance of having its scheduled courses adequately attended; and (b) to invite divisional views on the kinds of training that they felt their case officers needed at this stage in the history of the Clandestine Service--this as a step toward a better formulation of over-all Clandestine Service requirements. We were more successful in the first objective than in the second, and the DD/P has now decided that this kind of training estimate will in the future be required of all divisions as part of their annual operational program. It is our hope that we can thus contribute in a real degree to efficient planning and scheduling on the part of OTR.

SECRET

SECRET

9. Regarding the JOT Program, I would say only that we have received a preliminary survey of this program, with a series of recommendations, prepared by OTR's Plans and Policies Staff. This is being read by several senior officers in the Clandestine Service and when we have pooled our views we plan to discuss it at length with DTR. I should imagine that these views will be reflected in the more formal comments which we will hope to make on the Survey's recommendations on page 92.

10. The question of specific training requirements for specific assignments which is raised throughout the Survey, is a thorny one. An effort to do this in detail was made some six or seven years ago and the results were issued as regulations. They were not realistic, however, and in practice very little attention has ever been paid to them. It is one thing to establish minimum training requirements for young men or women new to the Agency who have not yet had overseas experience. It is another thing to list a series of courses which a chief of station, as such, should have taken. In practice what we seem to come up with is a general recognition that a man should have certain training "or its equivalent in experience". It is this last heading which has so far prevented the emergence of a regular pattern of training requirements, but it is also a real and necessary heading which we have to recognize. We have in the mill now a draft CSI on training which tends to leave to a large extent in the hands of divisional chiefs the establishment of requirements for positions under their command, but calls for their establishing these requirements, and places on the Clandestine Service Career Panels an obligation to see that candidates for assignment or promotion have received the training thus indicated.

11. With JOTs constituting far and away the greatest part of our new blood, I should think that the question of general training standards will come progressively to clarify itself. There is a far greater body of general instruction and experience which all Clandestine Service officers should have in common, than there is of special skills that they may individually require for a particular assignment. The latter is not too hard to identify in most cases. I share the conclusions of the Survey that the former, the general training requirements of Clandestine Service officers, can best be met through a phased program, of which JOT training is the first part, followed by mid-career and senior sessions at fairly well established periods and calling, at these periods, for the full-time participation of the officers concerned.

25X1A

DD/P Training Officer

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

DDP/TRO

NO.

DATE

6 Sept 1960

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

Acting DD/P

25X1A

2.

3.

Mr. Rubenstein

4.

319

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16 Feb 1961 declassified
cc go.

25X1A